

REMARKS

Initially, Applicant expresses appreciation to the Examiner for the courtesies extended in the recent in-person interview held with Applicant's representative. The amendments and remarks presented herein are consistent with those discussed. Accordingly, entry of this amendment and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

The Final Office Action, mailed February 19, 2009, considered and rejected claims 1, 3-23, 25-31, 33-37 and 40. Claims 1, 18, 23, 28, 37, 38 and 40 were objected to because of informalities corrected by this amendment, and as discussed during the in-person interview. Claims 1, 3-23, 25-31, 33-37 and 40 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Thebaut* (U.S. Patent No. 5,889,953) and *Kuznetsov* (U.S. Publ. No. 2006/0265689).¹

As discussed during the interview, Applicant's claims generally relate to dispatching data structures within SOAP envelopes for processing by groups of software methods. As reflected in claim 1, for example, an exemplary method includes accessing a soap envelope that includes a data structure that is to be dispatched to one or more software methods for processing. Subsequent to accessing the SOAP envelope, the computing system evaluates a list of rules to identify a multiple rules that apply to the dispatch of the data structure. All of the rules are specific to dispatch of the data structure within the SOAP envelope to one or more software methods, and the list includes rules that consist of software method dispatch rules, with each of the rules specifying a condition and a group of software methods for dispatch. After evaluating the list of rules, the plurality of rules are resolved down to a single rule that will be applied to dispatch of the data structure to a group of one or more software methods, and the computing system then dispatches the data structure to the group. Claims 28 and 40 recite computer program products and systems, respectively, which generally correspond to the method of claim 1.

As further discussed in the interview, while *Thebaut* and *Kuznetsov* generally relate to messaging within computing systems, they fail—whether cited alone or in combination—to render the pending claims unpatentable for at least the reason that they fail to disclose or

¹ Although the prior art status of the cited art is not being challenged at this time, Applicant reserves the right to challenge the prior art status of the cited art at any appropriate time, should it arise. Accordingly, any arguments and amendments made herein should not be construed as acquiescing to any prior art status of the cited art.

reasonably support all elements of the pending claims. For example, among other things, the cited art fails to disclose or reasonably support a method, computer program product, or system that operates to evaluate a list of rules that all apply to dispatch of a data structure to a method, and in which the list of rules consists of software method dispatch rules. As generally understood, "consists of" language is closed and therefore excludes other rules not related to software method dispatch.

In particular, *Thebaut* discloses a system by which policies are applied to network devices. Specifically, rule elements are applied to domain elements to create policies. The domain elements themselves represent network devices and groups of network devices, while the rule elements define actions. The system can also determine whether conflicts exist between policies and can resolve policies that are enforceable for the network devices.

Notably, *Thebaut* thus discloses policies related to network devices. Nothing in *Thebaut* in any way relates to a policy enforcement mechanism that chooses between different rules for dispatch of a data structure to software methods, let alone a system in which the different rules consist of software method dispatch rules (and are thus only related to software method dispatch). Indeed, the entire purpose of *Thebaut* is to provide mechanisms for defining policies affecting devices. Thus, to limit *Thebaut* to only software methods would be to subvert the express purpose of *Thebaut* and to render it inoperable for its intended purpose, which is interactions and policies defined between devices.

Applicant thus submits that the combination of *Thebaut* with any art that discloses selecting between rules related only to software method dispatch would be improper as it would render *Thebaut* inoperable for its intended purpose. This is all the more so when considered in connection with the *Kuznetsov* reference. In particular, *Kuznetsov* relates to a device that processes tagged data formatted according to a markup language (e.g., XML). The system applies transforms by selecting a transform rule set that selects which markup language transformation to apply to a portion of the message. The markup language processing device then applies a transformation and transforms the data.

As discussed during the interview, *Kuznetsov* thus describes a system in which data is transformed, but it fails to disclose or reasonably support a method or system that would limit rules to software methods, let alone to software method dispatch. Indeed, the rules described in *Kuznetsov* are related to data transform, rather than data dispatch. Thus, neither reference, nor the

combination of references, includes reasonable support for a method, computer program product, or system that finds, from a list of rules, multiple rules that apply for dispatch of a data structure to a software method, and which list includes only rules related to dispatch of a data structure, as recited in combination with the other elements in the claims. Indeed, limiting the list of rules to only software method dispatch rules would render both cited references inoperative for their intended purposes, namely device processing and data transformation.

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that the other rejections to the claims are now moot and do not, therefore, need to be addressed individually at this time. It will be appreciated, however, that this should not be construed as Applicant acquiescing to any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action regarding the cited art or the pending application, including any official notice. Instead, Applicant reserves the right to challenge any of the purported teachings or assertions made in the last action at any appropriate time in the future, should the need arise. Furthermore, to the extent that the Examiner has relied on any Official Notice, explicitly or implicitly, Applicant specifically requests that the Examiner provide references supporting the teachings officially noticed, as well as the required motivation or suggestion to combine the relied upon notice with the other art of record.

In the event that the Examiner finds remaining impediment to a prompt allowance of this application that may be clarified through a telephone interview, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned attorney at (801) 533-9800.

Dated this 16th day of June, 2009.

Respectfully submitted,



RICK D. NYDEGGER
Registration No. 28,651
COLBY C. NUTTALL
Registration No. 58,146
Attorneys for Applicant
Customer No. 047973